



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,823	04/28/2006	Michael W. Trainum	1041006	2840
7590 07/31/2008				
Michael Haynes 1341 Huntersfield Close Keswick, VA 22947			EXAMINER HOANG, SON T	
			ART UNIT 2165	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/31/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/577,823

Applicant(s)

TRAINUM ET AL.

Examiner

SON T. HOANG

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 18 July 2008
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 23, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. **Claims 1, 23, and 36-37** have been amended.

Claims 46-48 have been added.

Claims 1-48 are pending in this instant Office action.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's argument with respect to **independent claims 1, 23, and 36**, regarding the fact that Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) does not teach or suggest "*the distribution permission comprising a non-commercial permission*".

The Examiner concurs with Applicant's remark. However, it is noted that this newly added limitation is anticipated by Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*). Stefik discloses when a creator creates a digital work, he grants an Embed right and a Copy right, both of which require the distribution license to be exercised. He may optionally add a

Art Unit: 2165

Transfer or Loan right, so that end consumers can do some non-commercial exchange of the work among friends ([0353]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Stefik with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of permitting the owner or other authorized party to specify a manner of use of the content and to associate the manner of use with the content in a persistent way using a set of rights associated with a composite of digital work ([0015] of Stefik).

In view of the above, the Examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action. Hence, Applicant's arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

For the above reasons, the Examiner believes that rejection of this instant Office action is proper.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. As required by **M.P.E.P. 609(C)**, the Applicant's submissions of the Information Disclosure Statement dated July 18, 2008 is acknowledged by the Examiner. The cited references have been considered in the examination of the claims now pending. Applicant is noted that some of the documents have incorrect applicant's name(s) and/or publication date(s). As required by **M.P.E.P. 609 C(2)**, a copy of the PTOL-1449 initialed and dated by the Examiner is attached to the instant Office action.

Specification

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o).

Regarding **claims 1, and 36**, "*a machine readable medium*" is being recited within the claims. However, the Applicant did not explicitly provide any definition and/or example for this instant "*machine readable medium*" in the disclosure. Applicant further defines "*transmission media*" can take any form include wireless media (Specification, Page 6, [41]). It is noted that a transmission medium, which typically embodies computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules or other data in wireless modulated data signal such as electromagnetic wave, carrier wave or other transport mechanism and includes any information delivery media, are considered as a "*machine readable medium*" because transmission media can also be read by a machine/computer device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. **Claims 47-48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2165

Regarding **claims 47-48**, they refer to "the non-public permission" of **claim 1** whilst **claim 1** does not refer to any "*non-public permission*" at all.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 of **claims 1-22**, and **36-48** are maintained, as of this time, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matters.

Regarding **claims 1**, and **36**, "*a machine readable medium*" is being recited within the claims. However, the Applicant did not explicitly provide any definition and/or example for this instant "*machine readable medium*" in the disclosure.

It is noted that a transmission media, which typically embody computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules or other data in wireless modulated data signal such as electromagnetic wave, carrier wave or other transport mechanism, are considered as a "*machine readable medium*" since transmission media can also be read by a machine/computer device. Applicant further defines "*transmission media*" can take any form of wireless media (Specification, Page 6, [41]), thus the claimed "*machine readable medium*" are also considered as wireless media.

As such, the claims are drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim is not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

Claims 2-22, and 37-48 fail to resolve the deficiencies of **claim 1** since they only further limit the scope of **claim 1**. Therefore, **claims 2-22, and 37-48** are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2165

12. **Claims 1-9, 12, 14-17, 19-20, 23-31, 33, and 35-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*).

Regarding **claim 1**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a system comprising a machine readable medium storing instructions, executable by an information device (*Figure 2*), said instructions adapted to automatically manage:

a database storing a plurality of objects ([0030], and *Figure 4*); and

a computer-based document management module ([0033]) adapted to:

create a source document comprising the plurality of objects (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format, [0039]. It is clearly shown that the intermediate live file is the source document, i.e. template*); and

automatically and individually control a content, a plurality of content attributes (*Document and data list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414, privileges object 415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various versions of the document, [0035]*), a usage permission (*a printer may be allowed read-only access, [0041]*), and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple documents (*access privileges can be determined that each user may assert over each element of a brochure, [0041]. When only those with authorized privileges can access each of the derived elements, the*

Art Unit: 2165

distribution is clearly for non-public users) derived from the source document (*it is shown clearly that localized versions of a document are derived from an original/source version of the document, i.e. the intermediate live file or template, [0035]*).

Schneid does not explicitly disclose that the distribution permission comprising a non-commercial permission.

Stefik discloses when a creator creates a digital work, he grants an Embed right and a Copy right, both of which require the distribution license to be exercised. He grants a Play right so that the work can be played by anyone. He may optionally add a Transfer or Loan right, so that end consumers can do some non-commercial exchange of the work among friends ([0353]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Stefik with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of permitting the owner or other authorized party to specify a manner of use of the content and to associate the manner of use with the content in a persistent way using a set of rights associated with a composite of digital work ([0015] of Stefik).

Regarding **claim 2**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to define a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business*

Art Unit: 2165

communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]].

Regarding **claim 3**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to prevent modification of a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]].*

Regarding **claim 4**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to publish the source document (*the system coordinates live content file conversion into an output format and delivers to an output provider, [0010]).*

Regarding **claim 5**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to generate a derived document from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]*).

Regarding **claim 6**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to derive each of the multiple documents from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]*).

Regarding **claim 7**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to propagate a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission of the source document to each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 8 shows the output logic flow. Output logic 800 utilizes Templates object 411, images object 412, Fonts object 413, data lists object 414, Privileges object 415, Approvers object 417 and documents object 420 to produce Output for proofs or final output, preferably in Postscript, Portable Document format or XML. The output functions are preferably controlled using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]*).

Regarding **claim 8**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to prevent modification of a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission in each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]*).

Regarding **claim 9**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to determine an identity of the source document from each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 7 shows the comment logic flow of this exemplary embodiment. Comment logic 700 utilizes privileges object 415 to operate on comment subject 416 and documents object 420. Comments and versions are tracked for each document, each object of the document and for each version by user. The comment functions are preferably executed using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]*).

Regarding **claim 12**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to language-independently

search the database (*Different translations may be manually or automatically applied to sections or objects of the content, [0035]*).

Regarding **claim 14**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein each of the plurality of objects of the multiple documents is stored only once in said database (*DTP conversion 430 sends a native DTP file to Application Server 400 where Import Conversion Templates and Logic 440 operate on the Templates object 411 for each converted file, [0030]*).

Regarding **claim 15**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises content formatting information (*The Import content logic 450 sends content such as JPG and EPS formatted content objects to the images object 412 and other data objects in TTF or Type 1 format to Fonts object 413, [0030]*).

Regarding **claim 16**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises content type information (*The conversion processor scans the native file 920 to detect each object 950 thereof and for each object 950, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]*).

Regarding **claim 17**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises document structure information (*a design object 952 is parsed with location and format information and the interrelationships of each of the objects 950 and 952 are determined and stored in an object interrelation object 954. Similarly permissions object 953 may begin*

Art Unit: 2165

with standard permissions from a DTD or may be added by work flow clients, [0039]).

Regarding **claim 19**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of objects of the source document comprises a text object (*the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).*

Regarding **claim 20**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of objects of the source document comprises a graphical object (*the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).*

Regarding **claim 23**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a method (*Figure 3*), comprising a plurality of activities comprising:

via a computer-based document management module ([0033]):

creating a source document comprising a plurality of objects, each of said plurality of objects stored in a database (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format. The conversion processor scans the native file to detect each object thereof and for each object, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]. It is clearly shown that the intermediate live file is the source document, i.e. template); and*

Art Unit: 2165

automatically and individually controlling a content, a plurality of content attributes (*Document and data list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414, privileges object 415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various versions of the document, [0035]*), a usage permission (*a printer may be allowed read-only access, [0041]*), and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple documents (*access privileges can be determined that each user may assert over each element of a brochure, [0041]*). *When only those with authorized privileges can access each of the derived elements, the distribution is clearly for non-public users*) derived from the source document (*It is shown clearly that localized versions of a document are derived from an original/source version of the document, i.e. the intermediate live file or template, [0035]*).

Schneid does not explicitly disclose that the distribution permission comprising a non-commercial permission.

Stefik discloses when a creator creates a digital work, he grants an Embed right and a Copy right, both of which require the distribution license to be exercised. He grants a Play right so that the work can be played by anyone. He may optionally add a Transfer or Loan right, so that end consumers can do some non-commercial exchange of the work among friends ([0353]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Stefik with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of permitting the owner or other authorized

party to specify a manner of use of the content and to associate the manner of use with the content in a persistent way using a set of rights associated with a composite of digital work ([0015] of Stefik).

Regarding **claim 24**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising defining a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]*).

Regarding **claim 25**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising preventing modification of a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users*

with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 26**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising publishing the source document (*the system coordinates live content file conversion into an output format and delivers to an output provider, [0010]*).

Regarding **claim 27**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising generating a derived document from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]*).

Regarding **claim 28**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising deriving each of the multiple documents from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]*).

Regarding **claim 29**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising propagating a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission of the source document to each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 8 shows the output logic flow. Output logic 800 utilizes Templates object 411, images object 412, Fonts object 413, data lists object 414, Privileges object 415, Approvers object 417 and documents object 420 to produce Output for proofs or final*

output, preferably in Postscript, Portable Document format or XML. The output functions are preferably controlled using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]).

Regarding **claim 30**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising preventing modification of a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission in each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).*

Regarding **claim 31**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising determining an identity of the source document from each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 7 shows the comment logic flow of this exemplary embodiment. Comment logic 700 utilizes privileges object 415 to operate on comment subject 416 and documents object 420. Comments and versions are tracked for each document, each object of the document and for each version by user. The comment functions are preferably executed using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]).*

Regarding **claim 33**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising searching across the source document and each document derived from the source document (*Different translations may be manually or automatically applied to sections or objects of the content*, [0035]).

Regarding **claim 35**, Schneid further discloses a method, wherein each of the plurality of objects of the multiple documents is stored only once in said database (*DTP conversion 430 sends a native DTP file to Application Server 400 where Import Conversion Templates and Logic 440 operate on the Templates object 411 for each converted file*, [0030]).

Regarding **claim 36**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a machine readable medium storing instructions executable by an information device, for activities ([Column 4, Claim 16]) comprising:

creating a source document comprising a plurality of objects, each of said plurality of objects stored in a database (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format. The conversion processor scans the native file to detect each object thereof and for each object, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein*, [0039]. *It is clearly shown that the intermediate live file is the source document, i.e. template*); and

automatically and individually controlling a content, a plurality of content attributes (*Document and data list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414, privileges object 415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various*

versions of the document, [0035]), a usage permission (a printer may be allowed read-only access, [0041]), and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple documents (access privileges can be determined that each user may assert over each element of a brochure, [0041]. When only those with authorized privileges can access each of the derived elements, the distribution is clearly for non-public users) derived from the source document (it is shown clearly that localized versions of a document are derived from an original/source version of the document, i.e. the intermediate live file or template, [0035]).

Schneid does not explicitly disclose that the distribution permission comprising a non-commercial permission.

Stefik discloses when a creator creates a digital work, he grants an Embed right and a Copy right, both of which require the distribution license to be exercised. He grants a Play right so that the work can be played by anyone. He may optionally add a Transfer or Loan right, so that end consumers can do some non-commercial exchange of the work among friends ([0353]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Stefik with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of permitting the owner or other authorized party to specify a manner of use of the content and to associate the manner of use with the content in a persistent way using a set of rights associated with a composite of digital work ([0015] of Stefik).

13. **Claims 10-11, and 32**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schneid (Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002)* in view of *Stefik et al. (Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik)*, and further in view of *Hallett et al. (Pub. No. US 2004/0216033, filed on April 23, 2003; hereinafter Hallett)*.

Regarding **claims 10, and 32**, *Schneid*, as modified by *Stefik*, does not explicitly disclose a bi-directional comparison of the source document and a derivative document derived from the source document.

Hallett discloses validating one or more data blocks in a document derived from another document includes one or more processors collectively operable to access a number of first values in a predetermined portion of a source document and apply a code-generating algorithm to the first values to generate a first code representing the first values in the predetermined portion of the source document. The one or more processors are further operable to access a number of second values in a predetermined portion of a document derived from the source document, the predetermined portion of the derived document corresponding to the predetermined portion of the source document, and apply the code-generating algorithm to the second values to generate a second code representing the second values in the predetermined portion of the derived document. If the first code representing the first values in the predetermined portion of the source document matches the second code representing the second values in the predetermined portion of the derived document, it can be

assumed that within a predefined probability the derived document was accurately derived from the source document in that the second values in the predetermined portion of the derived document match the first values in the predetermined portion of the source document (0004)).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Hallett with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik, for the purpose of reducing or eliminating the error in validating document data by comparing data blocks of the derived document with data blocks of the source document ([0003] and [Abstract] of Hallett).

Regarding **claim 11**, Hallett further discloses a system to perform a bi-directional comparison of a first derivative document derived from the source document and a second derivative document derived from the source document (Figures 5A & 5B).

14. **Claims 13, 34, 38, 41, and 46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*), and further in view of Erickson (*Pat. No. US 6,807,534, filed on May 31, 2000*).

Regarding **claims 13, and 34**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik, does not disclose generating an auxiliary document from the source document, the auxiliary document reflecting at least a portion of a structure of the source

document, at least a portion of a content of the auxiliary document differing from a content of the source document.

Erickson discloses subsequent viewers and/or users of the DOCUMENT also communicate with the authorization server. Thus, in another aspect, the invention provides for the licensing of the media to creators of derivative works, i.e., those who modify an original work of authorship and who obtain authorization to do so through an augmentation in the permissions data set. As above, the modified DOCUMENT is then registered on a registration server and licensed through an authorization server. The DOCUMENT in this aspect preferably includes a sourceworks extension module which records the original and derivative authorship of the media. By retaining such information, a copyright "family tree" or electronic bibliographic record is maintained for the media. Preferably, the authorship information in the sourceworks extensions is resident as a data element within the DOCUMENT. However, the sourceworks extensions can also be maintained on or through the authorization servers, depending upon the number of servers used in the registration of derivative uses of the media ([Column 3, Line 61 → Column 4, Line 12]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Erickson with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik, for the purpose of providing on-line licensing and copyright management for electronic media through a secure electronic format and registration ([Abstract] of Erickson).

Regarding **claim 38**, Ericson further discloses allowing enforcement of instructions provided by an owner of the source document regarding legal use of the source document, the computer-based document management module adapted to allow security properties to be modified to a setting in each of the multiple documents that is more restrictive than the instructions provided by the owner (*the licensing is provided to creators of derivative media works, i.e., those who modify an original work of authorship and who obtain authorization to do so through an augmentation in the permissions data set. The modified DOCUMENT is then registered on a registration server and licensed through an authorization server. The DOCUMENT in this aspect preferably includes a sourceworks extension module which records the original and derivative authorship of the media. By retaining such information, a copyright "family tree" or electronic bibliographic record is maintained for the media,* ([Column 3, Line 61 – Column 4, Line 7])).

Regarding **claim 41**, Erickson further discloses responsive to a selection by an owner of the source document, remove all rights of the owner regarding the source document but retain all original credits at an edition or object level of the source document (*A record of the media source works is also available through the VIEWER. The sourceworks extensions provide a bibliography of the authors of the media so that the appropriate authors are credited with their works even after the works are edited by a derivative author. The sourceworks extensions are typically available within a display--sometimes denoted herein as*

the "Source Works Display"-- at the user's computer terminal, [Column 6, Lines 8-16]).

Regarding **claim 46**, Erickson further discloses wherein the usage permission comprises a by attribution security level, the by attribution security level adapted to build upon the source document without additional permissions so long as original credits remain in a new edition based upon the source document, the by attribution security level unchangeable by a user, the by attribution security level automatically copied to derivative versions of the source document, the by attribution security level not user changeable in the derivative versions of the source document (*the licensing is provided to creators of derivative media works, i.e., those who modify an original work of authorship and who obtain authorization to do so through an augmentation in the permissions data set. The modified DOCUMENT is then registered on a registration server and licensed through an authorization server. The DOCUMENT in this aspect preferably includes a sourceworks extension module which records the original and derivative authorship of the media. By retaining such information, a copyright "family tree" or electronic bibliographic record is maintained for the media,* ([Column 3, Line 61 – Column 4, Line 7]).

15. **Claims 18, and 21-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*), and further in view of Jones et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0188841, published on December 12, 2002; hereinafter Jones*).

Regarding **claim 18**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik, does not explicitly disclose the plurality of content attributes comprises content creator information.

Jones discloses a watermark is embedded into media content and the watermark conveys watermark information, such as a content identifier and creator identifier, ([0008]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Jones with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik, for the purpose of enabling digital asset management to reliably link media content with additional data about the content using watermarks ([0008] of Jones).

Regarding **claim 21**, Jones further discloses the plurality of objects of the source document comprises an audio object ([0049]).

Regarding **claim 22**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of objects of the source document comprises a video object ([0049]).

16. **Claim 37** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*), and further in view of Flores et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,370,498, published on April 9, 2002; hereinafter Flores*), and further in view of Drucker et al. (*Pub. No. US 2004/0215657, filed on April 22, 2003, hereinafter Drucker*).

Regarding **claim 37**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik, does not disclose the limitation of this instant claim.

Flores discloses allowing a user to search for a user-selected topic in each of the multiple documents and in the source document regardless of differences in language between the source document and at least one of the multiple documents (*The user will first select a particular work to view, generally chosen from a provided menu listing the works available on the database. Typically, once a work is selected, the user will be provided with a list of languages that the work is available in. For example, a user might choose the Shakespearean play of Hamlet and indicate that the languages the user would like to read the play in are Japanese and Portuguese. The software accesses the database, retrieving and then displaying for the user's view translations of Hamlet in both Japanese and Portuguese, [Column 6, Lines 28-42]*).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Flores with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik, for the purpose of providing a searching system that is beneficial for mono-lingual and/or multi-lingual users in researching by retrieving and displaying a particular work in multiple languages ([Column 3, Lines 46-52] of Flores).

Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Flores, does not disclose returning all editions of the multiple documents having a same shell identifier number as a found document that comprises the user-selected topic.

Drucker discloses when a user would like to find a particular book title written by Stephen King or one of his other pseudonyms published in the 1990's but does not know the title of the book, the author, and/or the year it was published, a user can enter one or more non-specific search terms in order to retrieve an object somewhat related to or in the neighborhood of the desired object (e.g., book cover/title). Thus, at 320, a cover of a book entitled "The Stand" published in 1990 and authored by Stephen King is centrally displayed to the user. At 330, a plurality of additional objects (e.g., book titles, movies, websites, news articles, etc.) having respective metadata associated therewith. The respective metadata of the additional objects are at least in part related to the metadata associated with "The Stand" are displayed peripheral to "The Stand" book cover ([0043]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Drucker with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Flores, for the purpose of accessing and browsing objects in which a user begins with a center object (e.g., one or a few focal objects) displayed on a screen and related objects are populated on the screen as well. The related objects can be further organized into clusters whereby each cluster or grouping of objects expands on a particular attribute of the center object, ([Abstract] of Drucker).

17. **Claims 39-40, 42, and 45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September*

12, 2002; hereinafter *Stefik*), and further in view of Ainsbury et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,078,924, published on June 20, 2000; hereinafter Ainsbury*).

Regarding **claim 39**, Schneid, as modified by *Stefik*, does not disclose the limitation of this instant claim.

Ainsbury discloses providing users of the source document with contact information of the owner for each of the plurality of objects of the source documents (*the Case Items are displayed in a list with each items' associated properties. Table 13 shows the property 'Author' which indicates user who set the collection item or added the information item, [Column 32, Lines 20-59]]. Table 13 also discloses the 'Owner' property which indicates the user name of current Case owner, [Column 30, Lines 13-34]]).*

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ainsbury with the teachings of Schneid , as modified by *Stefik*, for the purpose of providing a user with a market understanding necessary to execute rapid and knowledgeable decision making by organizing the library of information and providing analysis using multiple content-types ([Abstract] of Ainsbury).

Regarding **claim 40**, Ainsbury further discloses responsive to publication of the source document, lock all of the plurality of objects of the source document (*If the user creates a template from a Case, they are informed that the collection criteria for the Case Items and Search Items are cleared when the Case is saved as a template. The Case is saved as a template and the original Case is retained, [Column 40, Lines 46-50]]*), and allow an owner of the source document

to edit objects in each of the multiple documents after the source document has been published (*Users can then create a new Case from a template, the Case is created with the specified properties, Objectives, Case Items, and Search Items from the template. However, user can then modify these, adding, editing, or removing elements except the 'Case categories' attribute, which can only be edited by the owner of the template, [Column 37, Lines 49-55]*).

Regarding **claim 42**, Ainsbury further discloses responsive to a selection by an owner of the source document, enforce a right of the owner to require a user to include and retain contents of the source document in each of the multiple documents, the computer-based document management module adapted to allow the user to append an additional object into each of the multiple documents (*Users can then create a new Case from a template, the Case is created with the specified properties, Objectives, Case Items, and Search Items from the template. However, user can then modify these, adding, editing, or removing elements except the 'Case categories' attribute, which can only be edited by the owner of the template, [Column 37, Lines 49-55]*).

Regarding **claim 45**, Ainsbury further discloses the database contains a table that links a content identifier to an identifier of a container object of the source document. (*One of the primary functions of the Parsing Kernel (PK) is to read the source document and determine the page geometry. This geometry subdivides a document into the elements shows in Table 30. This table shows the 'Link' element which indicates an HREF to another document, or another part of this document, [Column 48, Line 40 -- Column 49, Line 25]*).

18. **Claim 43** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*), and further in view of Drucker et al. (*Pub. No. US 2004/0215657, filed on April 22, 2003, hereinafter Drucker*).

Regarding **claim 43**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik, does not disclose performing an Edition query that uses a Shell relationship to identify all other Editions in a Shell of Editions returned in the database query.

Drucker further discloses the computer-based document management module is adapted to, responsive to initiation of a search by a user, perform a database query, and responsive to a determination that the database query has returned data, the computer-based document management module adapted to perform an Edition query that uses a Shell relationship to identify all other Editions in a Shell of Editions returned in the database query (*the center object 520 on display can result from a user-based search that is narrow or broad wherein either search comprises inputting or selecting one or more metadata terms (e.g., attribute(s)) to facilitate accessing and browsing one or more desired objects. For example, an input component 540 receives a search request for a journal article entitled Banana Crops: The Next Generation written by Jane Smith on Jul. 7, 2002. One or more databases (not shown) can be accessed during such a search. The search can result in the center object being the front page of such article. Alternatively, a search request for attributes such as journal articles on the topic of genetically modified fruit written in July 2002 can yield a similar*

result. This similar result is based at least in part upon whether the metadata attached to such article has the strongest and/or closest match to the metadata/attributes contained in the search request, [0061]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Drucker with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik, for the purpose of accessing and browsing objects in which a user begins with a center object (e.g., one or a few focal objects) displayed on a screen and related objects are populated on the screen as well. The related objects can be further organized into clusters whereby each cluster or grouping of objects expands on a particular attribute of the center object, ([Abstract] of Drucker).

19. **Claim 44** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*), and further in view of Flores et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,370,498, published on April 9, 2002; hereinafter Flores*).

Regarding **claim 44**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik, does not disclose the limitations of this instant claim.

Flores further discloses the computer-based document management module is adapted to, responsive to entry of one or more search terms by a user, perform a database query, the query adapted to return to the user a search result in a different language from that of the one or more search terms (*For example, a user might choose the Shakespearean play of Hamlet and indicate that the*

languages the user would like to read the play in are Japanese and Portuguese. The software accesses the database, retrieving and then displaying for the user's view translations of Hamlet in both Japanese and Portuguese, [Column 6, Lines 28-42]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Flores with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik, for the purpose of providing a searching system that is beneficial for mono-lingual and/or multi-lingual users in researching by retrieving and displaying a particular work in multiple languages ([Column 3, Lines 46-52] of Flores).

20. **Claims 47-48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*), and further in view of Hartrick et al. (*Pat. No. US 5,428,529, published on June 27, 1995; hereinafter Hartrick*).

Regarding **claim 47**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik, does not explicitly disclose the limitation of this instant claim.

Hartrick discloses in Figure 9 a process of presenting copyright notices on each and every page of a document. Step 304 interrogates the default parameter table 56 to determine if there is a special copyright element with a flag bit on in column 62. Then step 310 determines whether the copyright notice is to be printed on all pages. If it is, then step 312 will print the copyright notice string on all pages. The process then flows to step 314 where it is determined whether a

Art Unit: 2165

security label is to be printed, by determining the presence of a corresponding flag bit in column 62 of table 56. Then step 318 determines whether the security label is to be printed on every page of the document ([Column 10, Line 37 → Column 11, Line 13]). Examples of special security string could be "Company Confidential" label ([Column 4, Lines 1-3]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hartrick with the teachings of Schneid , as modified by Stefik, for the purpose of managing the display or the printing of a copyright notice or security label for a soft copy document, so as to provide appropriate security for the document as desired by its author ([Abstract] of Hartrick).

Regarding **claim 48**, Hartrick further discloses the noncommercial permission causes a disclaimer to be printed in a front and back cover of each copy of each edition comprising the non-public permission, the disclaimer stating that the edition has been created for noncommercial distribution (*Figure 8C shows the restriction requirement can be displayed on all pages along with security labels also on all pages of a document. Note that restriction elements can be for example, a limited rights notice which the author wishes to place in his documentation*, [Column 9, Lines 63-65]).

Conclusion

21. These following prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure:

Young (*Pat. No. US 6,038,567*) teaches method and system for propagating object properties in a desktop publishing program.

Fucarile et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,766,305*) teaches licensing system and method for freely distributed information.

The Examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support(s) must be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the Examiner in prosecuting the application.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Contact Information

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Son T. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1752. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday (7:00 AM – 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2165

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Son T Hoang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2165
July 21, 2008

/S. P./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164

/Christian P. Chace/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165